RESTORATION REVIEW

Leroy Garrett, Editor

January, 1976 Vol. 18, No. 1

Volume 18, No. 1 **Leroy Garrett, Editor** **January 1976**

The Word Abused . . .

"LIVING IN ADULTERY": SECOND TIME AROUND

Since our article last year on "Living in Adultery" we have had such a vigorous response as to persuade us that the need for more study in this area is even greater than we presumed. Not only did we receive numerous letters from grateful souls who are now persuaded that there is some hope for people crushed by a broken marriage besides the oppressive measures usually meted out to them by leaders of their congregation, but several people wrote to tell us of particular instances among their own acquaintances of couples who not only had to suffer the pain of a shattered home, but who, amidst all the agony, had to take abuse from preachers and elders when they would not conform to the hard, legalistic line they laid down.

The following is typical, written by a sister in west Texas, about her daughter. The reference to the baby being taken from her helps us to see the misery this brought to the entire family. They had adopted the child from one of our orphanages. When the marriage failed almost a year later, the baby was taken back and given to someone else. The young mother then had to face her friends and relatives, all "our" church folk, schooled in the doctrine of "Living in Adultery."

> The husband would not accept counseling, and she could not stay with him unless he would. So the orphanage took the baby back after he had been ours for almost a year. She seemed to have enough heartbreak to finish her off when her mother-in-law called her to say she just wanted her to think over the fact that she would go to hell if she should ever marry again. We had to take her to a psychiatrist for months. These ex-in-laws are very faithful members of the congregation. We cannot be close any more, but we are not hateful to them. They nodded their heads in approval when the elders made public withdrawal of fellowship from another lovely, faithful girl who had been through a similar divorce and then married a Christian boy who had been divorced. Our daughter feels that the elders are so disapproving of her that maybe she is lost.

Walter Pigg sends us a story from Chicago of a sister he knew in the Pearl Harbor church, who led more people to Jesus than anyone else in the congregation. She was really a worker. She visited with backsliders and brought them back to the Lord, and if anyone came up missing at the assembly she would be among the first to check on them. She had

to return to the states when her husband was transferred. The next time Walter saw her, she explained why she was no longer attending any assembly:

> They told me that since George is my second husband that I was living in sin. No one taught me this when they studied with me before I was baptized. Now they have said, until I divorce my husband, I am not welcome. So I guess that's it. I can't divorce my husband. He is my life and I am his. I'll just have to trust in God's mercy, if there is any for me.

Brother Pigg also tells of this case, which touched upon his own life:

> In 1920 a young man of 20 married an immature girl and a year later their marriage was dissolved. In 1925 he remarried and four children came to this marriage. By 1960, when he was finally introduced to the gospel and baptized, his four children were all married and he had several grandchildren. Was this man to be told to divorce his wife and go looking for the bride of 1920? For me, this also brought further study because this man is my father-in-law, and grandfather to my children.

The examples of such religious oppression could be multiplied. As if life were not already an almost impossible task to most people with broken marriages, some of our leaders choose to place upon them burdens too heavy for them to bear. Young preachers, who know all too little about human suffering, will dare to tell married couples of many years that if they expect to serve Jesus they must dissolve their marriage and break up their home, however much misery this brings to parents and children alike. Elders, rooted in the "living in adultery" syndrome of Church of Christism, will treat divorce as if it were the unpardonable sin, and they will insist that the divorced brother or sister remain unmarried the rest of his or her life, however burdensome this may prove to be, unless of course the separated mate is guilty of adultery. If adultery did not cause the divorce, then the two "innocent" 'parties can wait it out, until one or the other marries again, committing adultery, which then frees the other one. He or she can then marry without "living in adultery." I remember a divorced preacher, waiting for his former wife to marry, so he could then "scripturally" marry again!

All this of course in the name of Jesus, the Prince of Peace!

Any interpretation of the teaching of Jesus that places upon people, young and old alike, burdens that are so overbearing as to make life tyrannical is suspect. Jesus is the answer, not the problem; he is fore bearing, not overbearing. He invites the weary. on the

grounds that his yoke is easy and his burden is light. His teaching must always be interpreted so as to be consistent with his grand mission on earth: "I came that they may have life, and have it abundantly" (Jn. 10:10). Or, as John puts it: "This is the love of God, that we keep his commandments. And his commandments are not burdensome" (1 Jn. 5:3). Peter's great invitation, "Come to him, to that living stone, rejected by men but in God's sight chosen and precious," (1 Pet. 2:4) is for all broken lives in every possible circumstance. To tell brother Pigg's father-in-law that in coming to Jesus he must give up the woman that has blessed and graced his life, because of a sin in his youth, is not only going too far, but makes Jesus a hard taskmaster instead of a merciful savior. The relevant passages can't mean *that,* however they are to be interpreted.

We present here a few propositions that may help to clear the air on the question of divorce and remarriage. They will sharpen some points that we made in the previous article and set forth still others. In all this we are not claiming to give the last word on the subject. To the contrary we suggest the relevant scriptures do not allow for dogmatism or absolute certainty. Some who speak on this subject know more than they really know, to quote Socrates. Our plea is for more openness, more forbearance, more understanding. We hope these propositions, which we believe will stand up, will encourage this.

1. *All people who are legally married are indeed married and therefore cannot be guilty of adultery in their relation with each other.*

This does not mean they may not have sinned in divorcing, and in all that led up to the divorce. Jesus recognizes that when one "marries another" he is married. Even if one has two wives at the same time, legally married to them both, he may be a bigamist but not an adulterer. David had several wives, and Jesus tells us that even from the beginning God did not intend it, that Moses allowed it because of hardness of heart (Mt. 19:3-9). So God really intended for David to have but one wife, But he did not commit adultery in sleeping with them all. Yet he did commit adultery when he slept with Bathsheba, who was not one of his wives. That is what adultery is: *sexual intercourse outside marriage.* Even today the tribal chief that missionaries come upon, who has 20 wives, is not an adulterer — unless he has relations with women beside those 20! His situation may not please God, just as David's did not, but it isn't *adultery* that is the problem. It's polygamy.

2. *Adultery is a God-designated sin, but "Living in Adultery" is a man designated sin, and there is therefore no such sin.*

Without exception "living in adultery" is applied to married people, who are not guilty of adultery for the simple reason that they are married. It is *never* applied to adulterers, people who have illicit sexual intercourse. One might point to Col. 3; 5-7 where Paul lists several sins, such as immorality and covetousness, and then says; "In these you once walked, when you lived in them," and come up with the idea of *living* in adultery. This would be all right, for this refers to *practicing* these particular sins. But our people do not use "living in adultery" in this sense, for they apply it to people they believe to be "unscripturally married," Only people who *commit* adultery can be accused of walking or living in it as in Col. 3:7. Since adultery is sex *outside* marriage, married people can in no way be accused of "living in adultery." It is a *theological* sin, devised by the clergy, against those that violate the divorce laws that *they* legislate.

3. *Sins committed in divorce and remarriage are not reparable as are many other sins.*

You hear it said that if a man steals a horse and then repents, he ought to return the horse; if he steals another man's wife and then repents, he ought to give the wife back. In short, one ought to quit sinning when he repents, whatever it is. But it is not so simple as that. A horse is mere property, a thing, something easily negotiable. When a man "steals" another man's wife it is far more than possessing another's property. He sleeps with her, and Paul says when this happens he becomes one body with her (1 Cor. 6:16). An old relationship has been broken and new one begun. If the man lives with her without legally marrying her, her husband might take her back and forgive her, like Hosea did. If he marries her, it becomes more complex, certainly after many years when there are children and even grandchildren. To pull that old bromide on such people, "If one steals a horse, etc.," is to be asinine and ridiculous. Returning property or money is one thing, but to demand measures that wreck still another marriage and still another family is something else.

Yes, people sin in divorcing and remarrying (period). As I said in my previous article, I conclude that to Jesus *all* divorces are sinful — *somebody* has sinned — or at least an evil (a couple marries and then discovers a grave sexual abnormality on the part of one; they immediately divorce with perhaps neither of them *sinning*, though it be an evil). But the sin of divorce and remarriage is of such a nature as not to be reparable; that is, the old relationships cannot be reestablished, nor does it follow that the new relationship must be severed. It can only be redeemed. God forgives even when reparation is impossible. Murder is an irreparable sin; slander often is. Still God will forgive. The person whose life

is strewn with a string of broken marriages can come to Jesus like any other sinner. Jesus will take him as he is, forgive his past, and sanctify his *present* marriage, teaching him that repentance means that he will quit his sin of divorce and remain married this time.

4. *Divorce is not the unpardonable sin.*

Jesus speaks of such a sin, but divorce is not it. Yet my brethren often treat divorced people as if it were the unpardonable sin. If the only way to "fix it" is to go back through a maze of tragic circumstances and restructure what has long faded away, then it must be unpardonable. If a young brother or sister, who fouled up a marriage while in high school or college and are now divorced, must live in celibacy the rest of their lives, casting to the wind all semblance of normalcy while yet in the bloom of youth, then it must be unpardonable. To the contrary, Jesus says that every sin that man commits against the Son of Man will be forgiven him (Mt. 12:31). There are many of our people, oppressed by the scourge of a broken marriage, who will rejoice that divorce is forgivable, even if irreparable.

It was amidst a bad marriage that one of the great prophets found these words, further esteemed by one of the great apostles:

Once you were no people but now you are God's people;
Once you had not received mercy but now you have received mercy. (1 Peter 2:10).
— the Editor

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

THY KINGDOM COME

Many of our people are uneasy in talking about the kingdom of God. They are far more comfortable with the church, and, for the most part, they dismiss the kingdom as simply one more description of the church. It is common for our preachers and teachers to equate the church and the kingdom, drawing no distinction between them at all. Any idea, therefore, of a *coming* kingdom is unthinkable, and to pray "Thy kingdom come," as Jesus did, is a rather serious error, for, after all, the kingdom has already come in the fact of the church. We might pray for the kingdom to grow or spread or be strengthened, but never to come, for it is improper to pray for something to come that has already come.

As a rule, therefore, we virtually ignore what is commonly known as the Lord's prayer, though in most churches it is continually prayed, usually in unison, with a great deal of appreciation. Were it not for that third line of the petition, *Thy kingdom come,* we too would make more use of it. I was reading the prayer of an aged brother recently in which he made a gallant effort to utilize the Lord's prayer and still be doctrinally sound. When he got to the third line, he altered it with: "We thank thee that thy kingdom has come."

Our purpose in this short essay is to suggest that all such painstaking is unnecessary and burdensome, and to show that it is both appropriate and scriptural for us to pray as Jesus taught his disciples to pray: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done, On earth as it is in heaven."

The scriptures make it clear that the kingdom is both present and future, and that the church is an expression of the kingdom. Heb. 12:28: "Let us be grateful for receiving a kingdom that cannot be shaken" and Col. 1:13: "He has delivered us from the dominion of darkness and transferred us to the kingdom of his beloved Son" surely refer in some way to God's reign in His church. Several of Jesus' parables indicate that with his ministry the kingdom of God was becoming a reality among men, working quietly in the hearts of men like seed sown in good soil. For Jesus and his disciples to insist that "The kingdom of God has come near to you" and "The kingdom of God is in the midst of you" makes it evident that the kingdom was and definitely is in the *now.*

And yet there are many more references that make it just as clear that the kingdom is future. Such as Lk. 13:29: "Men will come from east and west, and from north and south, and sit at table in the kingdom of God," and 2 Thess. 1:5: "This is evidence of the righteous judgment of God, that you may be made worthy of the kingdom of God, for which you are suffering." These can hardly be applied to the church. When angels in heaven cried out, "The kingdom of the world has become the kingdom of our Lord and of his Christ, and he shall reign for ever and ever" (Rev. 11:15) they surely had in mind more than what we call the church age. Gal. 5:21 and Eph. 5:5 both speak of inheriting the kingdom of God. It would be inappropriate to talk about the church that way.

It is like eternal life, which is a reality *now,* according to such passages as John 5:24, and a promise for the future, for Mark 10:30 says, "and in the world to come eternal life." Or it is like salvation, which is obviously now for those who are in Christ, but it is also in the future, for 1 Pet. 1:5 refers to "a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time. Generally speaking, these three — the kingdom of God, eternal life, and salvation — refer

to the same thing. They are all in the now and in the future, and they are all in some sense evident in the church, but in no wise identical with it. In this world we may "taste" the powers of the age to come (Heb. 6:5), but the banquet is yet to be.

The kingdom is something like the bouquet of roses I sometimes present to Ouida (it should be every day!). I have learned that the long-stemmed ones still in the bud are the most desirable, and the most expensive. Once they are placed in a vase and grace the table, they are indeed a bouquet of beautiful roses. But their full glory is yet to be, for each bud will burst forth in breathtaking splendour. A rose in the bud is of course a rose, but there is much more to a rose when it is in full blossom. So it is with God's kingdom. Yes, God's rule in the hearts of His children that make up the Church of God on earth is the kingdom of heaven among men, but it is a serious mistake to suppose that there is no greater manifestathm of the kingdom yet to be.

We cannot be sure of the precise nature of God's tomorrow for us, but we can be confident that it will be "an inheritance imperishable, undefiled, and unfading kept in heaven for you" (1 Pet. 1:4). The same apostle says that "we wait for new heavens and a new earth in which righteousness dwells" (2 Pet. 3:13). Again and again the scriptures speak of "the glory that is to be revealed," such as in Rom. 8:18. That same chapter indicates that the earth itself has a destiny in God's plan, for, along with all creation, it will be "set free from its bondage to decay and obtain the glorious liberty of the children of God." Perhaps this is the "new earth" that Peter hopes for. This may be what Jesus was promising when he said: "Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth."

We are "kingdom people" while living in this age, which means that we really belong to "the age to come" or to the kingdom to come. We are "a colony of heaven" while in this world (Philip. 3:20), and we await a Savior who will give us a glorious body like his own. So, we have been delivered from this "present evil age" (and that should be rendered *age* rather than world) and are therefore to live transformed lives, not conforming ourselves to this age (Rom. 12:2). Paul assures us that when we follow "the course of this age" we are disciples of "the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that is now at work in the sons of disobedience" (Eph. 2:2).

All time for us is therefore in terms of this age and the age to come. Jesus used this very language over and over. In Lk. 20:34 he speaks of "the sons of this age" and then of those "who are accounted worthy to attain to that age and to the resurrection of the dead." To live *after* this age is to be carnal and worldly, "minding earthly things;" to live *in* this age as a disciple of Jesus is to be a tent-dweller and an alien, one whose citizenship is in

the age to come. Paul divides it another way: “We look not to the things that are seen (this age) but to the things that are unseen (the age to come)” (2 Cor. 4:18). He goes on to speak of the building we have from God, eternal in the heavens, and says that the Lord has given us the Spirit as a guarantee that all these things will be true for us (2 Cor. 5:5).

We have a lot going for us in God’s tomorrow, the kingdom to come. We await a Savior from Heaven. He will give us glorified bodies. We will have a building from God in heaven. In some way we will share in the New Jerusalem that comes down out of heaven — and will it come to the renewed earth that Jesus promises us?

We have no way of knowing all that is in the offing while we are still in this age moving toward the age to come. There are strong indications in scripture that all the nations will hear the gospel before the end (Mt. 24:14), that there will be a general reign of peace because of the spread of the knowledge of the Lord (Isa. I1:1-9), that the Jews will be converted and bring great blessing to mankind (Rom. 11), that Jesus will reign with his saints for a thousand years (Rev. 20).

Just how God will put all this together we are not likely to know until “the perfect” comes, for “then I shall understand fully, even as I have been fully understood” (1 Cor. 13:12). It should be enough for us to realize that God has already revealed to us that into which angels longed to look, and that the sufferings of this age can in no wise be compared to the glory that is to be further revealed to us. That God is still up to something is evident enough. That His kingdom is yet to be unfolded with still greater glory, both in this age and the age to come, is evident enough from scripture.

So, we not only *may* appropriately pray “Thy kingdom come,” but we *should.* If the same Jesus who said, “The kingdom of heaven is within you,” could go on and teach his disciples to pray for its coming, then we too can think and pray in such terms. —*the Editor*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

Pilgrimage of Joy. . .

IN THE BEGINNING

By W. Carl Ketcherside

I was born early in the morning of May 10, 1908, in a little two-room miner's cabin in a poverty-stricken village called Cantwell, nestled in the eastern foothills of the Missouri Ozarks. My advent was at a very inauspicious time during the presidential tenure of Theodore Roosevelt, for I made my debut on the heels of the great financial panic of 1907, a matter to which I gave little thought at the time. My father was William Ketcherside and he had married Anna Marguerite Hansen some eighteen months before I entered the scene as "a howling success." There were five other children to follow to compose a family circle of three boys and three girls. All of us are still alive as I write these words.

All of the Ketchersides (or Ketchersids, for some dropped the final "e" about the year 1800) are descended from one progenitor, Thomas Ketcherside, who came over from Scotland shortly before the time of the American Revolution. His family settled in Virginia and North Carolina. Our branch of the clan emigrated to Missouri after it became United States territory as part of the Louisiana Purchase, and took up land in the then wild country called the "Black River region." The third highest peak of the Missouri Ozarks appears on our state map as Ketcherside Mountain.

Like a lot of pioneers, the men were hard and tough. They prided themselves on the amount of raw whiskey, called rot-gut, which they could gulp down and upon their ability to settle brawls with their fists in bare-knuckle fighting. My great grandfather deserted his family and "shacked up" with a Cherokee Indian woman who had been abandoned when her family died on the frightful "Trail of Tears" march in which many thousands perished while' crossing Illinois and Missouri enroute to the Oklahoma Territory.

My great-grandmother was, so I am told, a gentle Scotswoman who still retained the dialect of "Auld Scotia." She kept the family together, and although none of them ever went to school, or learned to read or write, she invested them with a degree of integrity and a reasonable sense of respect. My own grandfather, Woodson Ketcherside, even as a lad, demonstrated qualities which later endeared him to all who knew him. When he first saw my grandmother, Lavina Moses, she was a mere girl, working barefoot in a rocky hill field and wielding a heavy hoe.

As an orphan, she had been indentured to a man for whom she was required by law to work for her "board and keep" until she became eighteen. The lot of such "bound children" in the days before orphan homes was often a difficult one. Taking compassion

upon her when she was fifteen, my grandfather-to-be paid off the sum assessed for the final three years and obtained her release. He bought her a pair of shoes and a simple dress and they were married when he was seventeen and she was still but fifteen. I think their union was one of the happiest and most contented I have ever seen. With the opening of the deep shaft lead mines near Bonne Terre, they moved to a rugged hill farm some three miles from that struggling town, built a log cabin and began to rear their growing family in a kind of wilderness setting where hardship was a way of life and the wolf of hunger was seldom far from the rude door swung on leather hinges.

There was but little chance for an education and the Coonville school, a couple of miles distant, was in session only sporadically as a wandering teacher came through and arranged to teach a few weeks for a meager pittance while “boarding around” a week at a time in the homes of the scholars in the area. Since the chief aim of the community rowdies was to “run the teacher off” and they felt a sense of abject failure if one remained more than six weeks, opportunities for intellectual development were decidedly limited. The rustic homes were utterly devoid of reading materials. There were no newspapers, magazines or books. Only an occasional Bible was to be found and it was regarded with superstitious awe, as containing a passage which would instantaneously stop nosebleed when read by someone who knew its location in the sacred text.

There were no churches and no regular meetings for religious devotion or instruction. Only when an itinerant Methodist or Baptist preacher rode in along one of the trails and announced “preaching in the schoolhouse” did the folk gather to be exhorted to flee from the wrath to come. A boy was sent on a mule to inform the dwellers in remote cabins about the great event and all came, more for the diversion than for the spiritual uplift. The preachers were hardy, with faces deeply tanned and hands that were calloused. They worked in the fields or in the timber side by side with those who “put them up for the night” and prided themselves that they could lay out a row in the field or hew a beam as straight as “the best of them:” They were also fearless and had no qualm about stepping off of the platform to walk back and grab a disturbing ruffian by “the nape of the neck and the seat of his breeches” and throw him unceremoniously into the schoolyard. Then dusting off their hands they would invite anyone else who wanted “some of the same” to step forward and request it before they resumed preaching.

As a little lad I used to listen spellbound as my grandfather, who was a master story teller, recounted incidents related to school and church in the backwoods. Always reverential, while being as courageous as a wildcat, he told about the times he had pitched in to help the preacher, and with the aid of a stick of stove wood or a window prop had

converted a lot of toughs from an upright to a prone position. He liked best to tell of a Methodist preacher who was very small in stature and who rode his jaded horse into the community after the last three meetings had been "busted up" by a gang of roughnecks.

The wiser heads tried to dissuade the short, thin man from announcing a meeting but "he allowed as how he could handle it with the help of the Lord." The schoolhouse was crowded to capacity the first night with the better element in fear and trembling, while the boorish louts were scuffling with and pawing at each other in the back. The little preacher stepped behind the teacher's desk and called for silence in order to begin a song to the praise of God. The noise in the rear became louder and more raucous. Nervous tension filled the air.

The preacher calmly said, "We will adjourn to the schoolyard. Follow me please!" As he walked down the aisle he was followed by the wondering audience, some of whom whispered that he was scared out and giving it up. Without saying another word, when he reached the schoolyard, the preacher stooped down and picked up three walnuts from under a tree, and then yanked a six-shooter out of his hip pocket. One by one he threw the walnuts into the air and without a miss shot them to bits. Then he picked up three more and threw them high into the air at once and cracked all three. The fragments of the walnut shells rained down on the heads of the gaping crowd.

Taking six bullets out of his side pocket the preacher again loaded his gun. His fingers did not tremble. He looked up and said, "We will return to the house. Follow me, please!" The awe-stricken rustics all trooped in behind him. It was still as a morgue when the preacher took his place again. Not a sound disturbed the deathly quiet. Laying his trusty six-shooter on top of the Bible he announced, "I propose to discourse with you tonight about the Prince of peace and I will tolerate no interruption." There was no interruption to tolerate. If someone shuffled his feet the preacher merely glanced at the gun and the shuffling stopped. The meeting lasted three weeks and "the mourners" were all over the place when "the altar call" was made.

In this kind of rural environment my father finished the third McGuffey Reader and mastered the first part of Ray's Practical Arithmetic. It had to be done "in hitches" as someone later explained it. While still a child he contracted smallpox during an epidemic, and due to lack of proper care, since there were no doctors to summon for advice, one of his eyes was permanently impaired and the muscle in one leg shriveled away and left that limb shorter than the other. This did not interfere with his hunting or "frolicking" as the old-timers referred to almost any activity except hard work. He became a crack-shot with a

gun and regularly carried off every prize from the shooting-matches. He also became a fiddle-player of note and this made him extremely popular at the hoedowns which generally continued all night or until someone got “likkered up” and started a “knock-down-and drag-out.”

He got a job underground when he was not yet sixteen years old and this meant working ten hours per day, six days per week, for eleven cents an hour. Every day, at a time depending upon which shift he worked, he went to the changing-room where he took off his street-clothes, hung them up on hooks, and then put on his wet, dirty, slimy miner’s garb. He went to the large can of carbide, filled his lamp, hooked it on the front of his cap, stepped on the cage and made his descent into the bowels of the earth.

Perhaps because he was so young, and felt the need to prove himself among the older hard-bitten miners, he developed a vocabulary of profanity which would have shocked people in almost any other part of the world. When I was grown and returned to “the Lead Belt” as the area came to be called, grizzled old-timers would search me out and say, “I knowed your Pap when he first went to work underground. He could out-cuss a mule skinner.” They said it with a note of envy such as one uses when he speaks of another who has achieved a degree of proficiency in a coveted art which the speaker has not been able to reach.

The young William Ketcherside, if one may judge by the posed photographs taken by wandering photographers, was a rather handsome swaggering young specimen of manhood. When he was “on top” he smoked a pipe filled with Bull Durham, always allowing the string of the tobacco sack to hang from his shirt-pocket in the latest style. When he was underground he could not smoke because of the danger from powder and dynamite, so he took up chewing Brown Mule, and practiced spitting through his front teeth. He was a foul-mouthed and obscene product of a place and a time where you had to be as tough as a hickory sapling to survive.

When the Spirit of God got through to him and transformed him it was one of the most thorough and traumatic changes I have ever known. It is also one of the first things I remember and, of course, it affected my whole future on earth. I must tell you about it, but before I do I want to tell you about my mother, whose parents came to this land as immigrants from the “old World” as Europe was then designated.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

Bicentennial Notes on Restoration History . . .

RESTORATION EFFORTS BEFORE THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Early on the morning of Dec. 15, 1974, a few hours before gathering with the saints at the old Coplaw Street Church of Christ, it was my pleasure to visit the Old Cathedral in Glasgow, Scotland, whose elegant spire has stood like a sentinel over the ancient city since the Middle Ages. The old kirk was once the home of the archbishops who ruled Scotland for the pope in Rome, and it went on to witness the great Reformation under Luther, which swept through old Scotia under the leadership of the fiery John Knox.

The reformation adage, "The blood of martyrs became the seed of the kingdom," was especially true of Scotland. John Knox himself, born in 1505 (12 years before Luther nailed his theses on the Wittenberg castle door), was inspired by George Wishart, who was burned at the stake for. preaching the priesthood of all believers throughout Scotland. Young Knox would stand at Wishart's side, with his sword drawn, protecting him from the papal forces which still held sway in that country. But a single sword was not enough. The cardinal that condemned Wishart to the stake was himself murdered not long afterwards. Scotland was bleeding in those days, not only with the blood of her sturdy sons who would reform her, but from the continuing war with England that had gone on for over two centuries.

Patrick Hamilton is one of the great names in Scottish history. He was of royal lineage, educated at the influential University of Paris, and motivated by the teachings of Erasmus. He was on the faculty at Edinburgh when the Parliament ruled that Luther's work could not be circulated or read anywhere in Scotland. This stirred his evangelical soul, and he was soon advocating reform everywhere. He died heroically at the stake in 1528.

But Scottish martyrs had borne witness to reformation for a century or more before Knox, Hamilton and Wishart. John Resby, a Lollard preacher, and Paul Crawer, a Hussite, were burned for disseminating their antipapal views in 1407 and 1432, respectively. For a century and a half a religious war was waged between papal forces until finally, in 1560, when Knox's preaching led to the destruction of shrines, images and cathedrals, the Parliament recognized the reformers as victorious. Knox was asked to draw up a summary of doctrine, which was strictly Calvinistic, which became the "official" religion of the country. This was the beginning of the Church of Scotland, which, as we shall see in our ensuing study, became as intolerant and persecuting as the Roman Church, a fact that is helpful in understanding the early history of our own Restoration Movement.

Such history as all this seemed to fill the air around the old Glasgow Cathedral as I walked her yards that cold December morn, where, they say, as many as a *million* (!) saints are interred. Before my mind's eye passed the gallant lives of John Glas, Robert Sandeman, Greville Ewing, John Campbell, Pastor Innes of Stirling, and the Haldane brothers, Robert and James. All these were Scotland's own native sons, reared in the official state church, who finally, one by one, left that church and started free congregations. They staged a reformation or restoration that called down the fury of ecclesiastical authority upon them. Thomas Campbell, a pastor in his native Ireland, was exposed to their thinking when some of them made their way across the Irish sea. Alexander Campbell was exposed to it even more when he studied in Glasgow in 1808. All this we shall be reviewing in subsequent installments.

Had I listened quietly enough that Lord's day morn I might have heard, through the ear of faith at least, the clarion voice of Rowland Hill, the English evangelist, who was brought to Scotland in 1798 by the Haldane brothers. His preaching of Jesus fired the hearts of the Scots like the poetry of their own Robert Burns. Rowland Hill remained always a part of the Church of England, working for reform from within. Chastened by the ignorance of the gospel he found even within the church, along with all the carnality, he was dedicated to the cause of church reform.

One of Hill's great meetings was right there on the grounds of the old Cathedral, where 5,000 persons heard him lift up Jesus as the light of life. Basing his remarks on Isa. 60:19, where the prophet says, "The Lord shall be unto thee an everlasting light, and thy God thy glory," he urged the people to accept Jesus as God in Christ, the hope of glory and the light of the world. Robert Haldane, a wealthy layman who worked outside the established church, brought Hill to Scotland, and together they brought many laymen into a reformation movement. Robert Haldane, an old sea captain whose story we shall be telling with some detail, preached reform with such zeal that he sometimes had to refrain on account of spitting up blood.

It does something to you, standing there all alone amidst so great a cloud of witnesses, realizing that within the thick walls of that ancient shrine lie the remains of Robert Haldane himself. It says something for the independent mind of the Scots that they would bury the old reformer within the sacred blocks of the Cathedral.

It was in the days of Rowland Hill and Robert Haldane that Bobby Burns, old Scotia's homemade poet, wrote as follows, in honor of a humble cottager, who would no doubt have responded to the call for reform:

Compared with this, how poor Religion's pride,
In all the pomp of method and of art

When men display to congregations wide
Devotion's every grace, except the heart!

The Power incensed, the pageant will desert,
The pompous strain, the sacerdotal stole;

But haply, in some cottage far apart,
May hear, well pleased the language of the soul,

And in His book of life the inmates poor enrol.

Agony and tragedy marks Scottish history, whether religious or political. Two centuries ago our own Patrick Henry urged our founding fathers against the English with that cry, "Give me liberty or give me death!" and he went on to enjoy the liberty won as a governor of Virginia, dying peacefully in his old age. Scotland's counterpart would be William Wallace, who also urged his countrymen against the English, leading the army himself, as did our George Washington. While he gained momentary victory, his lot was at last an ignominious death. The king of England mangled his body and impaled it on London Bridge, inspiring that line from Burns:

O Thou who poured the patriotic tide
That streamed through Wallace's undaunted heart.

The young bard used the right word to describe the Scottish spirit — *undaunted.* The Scots first appear in history keeping the Romans at bay, and a millennium later they are routing the English, always struggling to be a free people. Since 1707, seven decades before our own birth as a nation, they have been a voluntary *(voluntary,* they'll have you know!) member of the British Commonwealth. Since the union of the two countries no British monarch has dared to wear the crown worn by the rulers of Scotland. For 269 years Scottish guards have watched over the glass-encased crown in the old castle in Edinburgh, once worn for nearly half a century by their beloved Mary, Queen of Scots. The present British monarch, after her own coronation in Westminster Abbey in London, visited the crown room in Scotland. She gently put forth a hand and barely touched the crown, as if to

pay homage to that “patriotic tide that streamed through Wallace’s undaunted heart.” It is a crown that will never again be worn, unless perchance a Scot someday rules over the British Empire.

Such is the spirit of Scotland. Her history has lent distinction to her culture, literature, law, education, and religion. The Church of England, like ourselves, has congregations in Scotland, but, also like ourselves, they must be part of the free churches, separate from the Church of Scotland. Her several universities are among the oldest and most renowned in the world. Her system of justice has for centuries been uniquely respected by the world of jurisprudence. Her scientists invented both TV and penicillin.

And this is the spirit of her martyrs and reformers. It is an august roll call the Hamiltons, the Knoxes, the Haldanes, the Wisharts, both before and after our own Revolution. John Knox came up from a galley slave to wrest power from the pope in Rome, and her adopted son, Alexander Campbell, came out of a wreck at sea to find new directions in her changing religious culture.

But in this first installment of notes on our history as a distinct religious movement, I want to review briefly a few other examples of restoration thought that go back before the American Revolution.

Only heaven knows all those lesser lights who have worked for reform, serving their own generation, not even a tithing of which are even mentioned in the history books. Some of them were especially conscious of the unity of the Spirit, realizing that a divided church could never be the true Church of Christ on earth. There was, for example, one George Calixtus: a Lutheran, who lived from 1586 to 1656. His father studied under the great Melanchthon. He antagonized his fellow Lutherans by advocating union not only with other Protestants but with Roman Catholics as well. His basis of union: “what has been believed always, everywhere, and by all,” which is strikingly similar to some of the slogans of our own Movement.

Then there was John Dury (1595 - 1680), another Scotsman, by the way, but one who labored all over Europe, appearing before courts as well as churches, advocating a unity based upon “practical divinity” rather than “ordinary philosophical jangling” of the creedal theologies, which sounds as if it were lifted from our own Thomas Campbell’s *Declaration and Address.* And he sounded like Barton W. Stone, over a century before Cane Ridge,

when he contended that all Protestants should be called simply "Reformed Christians." For 50 years this man labored among the warring factions, pleading for freedom in Christ and calling for a cessation of those controversies that divide believers.

There were even books published on unity that far back. Hugo Grotius (1583-1645) wrote *The Way to Ecclesiastical Peace,* in which he appealed to primitive Christianity as the basis for oneness. And Edward Stillingfleet of the Church of England published his *Irenicum* in 1662, in which he pled for unity on the ground that nothing should be made a basis for communion that Jesus did not make a basis for discipleship. He insisted that divisions have been caused by "the adding of other conditions" than those required by Jesus and his apostles. A German, Christoph Mathew Pfaff, issued his *Pacific Address* in 1720 in which he pled for unity on the ground that all Protestant churches are in essence one.

There were still others who may be better known to you. Richard Baxter (1615-1691) was a Puritan who was fined and imprisoned for preaching reform, and he was a fervent advocate of unity. He gave us the slogan adapted by the Campbells: "In fundamentals, unity; in non-fundamentals, liberty; in all things, charity." John Bunyan (1628-1688) was another Puritan who was imprisoned for preaching contrary to traditional doctrines of the Anglican Church. During one long imprisonment he produced *Pilgrim's Progress,* which is a plea for biblically-based piety. Archbishop James Usher (1581-1656) is known more for his chronology in the *King James Bible* than for his efforts toward reform and unity. He must have been the only Irish Roman Catholic of high rank who accepted Presbyterian ordination and advocated union with them.

Most all this reformed thinking had two characteristics: it took place for the most part *within* the churches, and they were efforts, in one way or another, to recover the simplicity of primitive Christianity. They did not think of themselves as innovators introducing new doctrines, but as agents of renewal seeking to recover the old doctrines. Luther had long since said in his commentary on Galatians: "We teach no new thing, but we repeat and establish old things, which the apostles and all godly teachers have taught before us." Lancelot Andrewes (1555-1626) was one of the 47 scholars who produced the *King James Version,* and he also was a reformer within the Anglican church, though not a Puritan. Pleading for a return to the New Testament norm, he said: "We are renovators, not innovators." *Renovators, not innovators!* Hardly any saying coming out of pre-Revolutionary history so well summarizes the ideal set forth by our own pioneers. And Alexander Campbell was to say in his day what Bishop Hugh Latimer said in his, almost in the same words: "But you say, it is new learning. Now I tell you it is the old learning."

Latimer had to burn at the stake for saying that, in defiance of "Bloody" Queen Mary, being among the 300 (one-fifth of them women!) that she executed as heretics. Campbell suffered in a different way when he said it. But what Latimer said at the stake just before his death, Campbell could have also said: "Be of good comfort, Master Ridley (who was dying with him), we shall this day light such a candle by God's grace in England, as I trust, shall never be put out!"

Thank God that the candles lighted by dedicated reformers have not only kept burning all these years, but they have grown into mighty torches that turn all the brighter the more they are born and shaken by continuing generations!

Lastly, this kind of thinking is reflected in some pre-Revolutionary philosophy and literature, which shows that it penetrated circles beyond the church itself.

The pen of John Locke is generally credited for having ignited three revolutions — the French, the Cromwellian in England, and the American. This is because of the philosophical base he gave for questioning of the old doctrine of divine right of kings, teaching as he did that the power to rule really comes from God and resides with the circumstances, making it easier to muster a nation against injustices contrived against it. He spoke of moral law as few have, and his reference to inalienable rights as life, property, and the pursuit of happiness inspired our own Constitution.

In his *Letter Concerning Toleration* (1689), he revealed his conviction that the simple faith of primitive Christianity, and that alone, should be the basis of communion between believers, even though he belonged to the Church of England.

> Since men are so solicitous about the true church. I would only ask them here, by the way, if it be not more agreeable to the Church of Christ to make the conditions of her communion consist in such things and such things only, as the Holy Spirit has in the Holy Scriptures declared, in express words, to be necessary to salvation?

This is one source for Alexander Campbell's constant plea that nothing should be made the basis of union that God has not made a basis for salvation. Campbell greatly admired Locke, referring to him now and again as "the Christian philosopher." That Locke has had his role in our own Restoration heritage is evident in the fact that the pioneer preachers carried in their saddlebags a copy of his *Essay Concerning Human Understanding* along with a Bible and a hymnal. Locke contended that "the first planting of Christianity in the

world gives no countenance to the exclusive claim of any national church to determine doctrine, ritual and worship for all," which may be as relevant today as it was in his day, written as it was in defense of non-conformity.

A rather unexpected advocate of the primitive faith was Daniel Defoe, author of *Robinson Crusoe.* He led an eventful life, not only as novelist and journalist, but also as a spy for the British government. Coming from a family of Dissenters, he published in 1702 a satirical essay, poking fun at the established church for its bigotry. By this time persecution was less severe in England, so for this he was only pilloried. The public applauded his stand and brought gifts to him while in the stocks. He must have had a sense of humor, for he then wrote verses on *Hymn to the Pillory!* He was among the first in history to issue a periodical, in which he advocated social and religious reforms.

It was in *Crusoe* that he states his case for primitive Christianity. Finding this savage on the island, whom he names Friday, Crusoe proceeds to teach him the Christian faith from the Bible he rescued from the wrecked ship. The scriptures and the scriptures alone become the source of religious knowledge both for him and Friday. Finally Crusoe acknowledges that Friday has become a Christian, even a better one than himself. "We had here the word of God to read, and no farther off from his Spirit to instruct, than if we had been in England." He goes on to applaud the simplicity of the plan of salvation, so clearly set forth in the scriptures. He testifies that the truth led him to repentance, and Friday as well — all this without any teacher except the word itself.

Crusoe then says: "The same instruction sufficiently served to the enlightening of this savage creature, and bringing him to be such a Christian as I have known few equal to him in my life," and he goes on to refer to the Bible as "the sure guide to heaven." Referring to all the disputes and contentions in religion over the niceties of doctrine, he could not see that he and Friday needed these at all. Even if they had the greatest knowledge in the world on all the disputed points of religion, he could not see that they would have been of any value.

DeFoe quite obviously was speaking for no orthodox opinion, but only as a free man. All these testimonials indicate that any effort toward reform point in one way or another to the primitive faith and the sufficiency of the scriptures. And so we have seen that long before the American Revolution, which was itself a half century before the Stone-Campbell effort, there were constant rumblings of reform both within and without the established churches. In all cases its effectiveness depended on the degree to which it reached the grassroots. Already it is evident that while many clergymen did indeed become

reformers, the broader influences were imposed by the rank and file who were less dependent on the church. That restoration movements, which means the same as *reformation* movements, have for the most part been "lay movements" will become more evident as we proceed with our study. —*the Editor*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

OFFICE NOTES

When your subscription expires, your last copy is stamped "Your Sub Expires with this Issue" on both front and back. You need not be concerned about our dropping your name until this stamp appears. Usually, but not always (depending on our supply), we send you a second notice in the form of one more issue, marked "Final Notice, etc." But it is not advisable to delay if you wish to continue with us. If you do not renew, we drop your name from our list because we want all our subscribers to be *readers.* We are not in this for the money, which is just as well, nor have we any interest in a large subscription list *per se.* We want to be of some help to those who are willing to think and grow. We almost never hear of anyone who cannot afford to pay our modest rates, but when such instances come to our attention, we send them the paper free. If *this* is ever your reason for not renewing, please do not hesitate to let us know.

If perchance the expiration stamp appears before if should, it means that we have made a mistake, and please drop us a card and bawl us out. And *please,* when you move, send us BOTH your old and new addresses. We have you filed only by your zip code (the mark of the beast!) and not by your name, so if you send us only your new address, we have to write to you at that address and ask you where you used to live! The post office is well aware of this problem and furnishes cards free of charge for this very purpose. Just follow the directions on the label! We can also serve you better if, when you renew, you will tell us it is a *renewal* — that word on the check is sufficient. When you send us lists of names, which we strongly urge you to do (only 1.00 per name in clubs of 5 or more!), please distinguish the renewals from the new ones. If you have the urge to renew, go on and yield to it even if your sub has not expired, for we push your sub as far ahead as you wish. Some of our readers are paid up for five years in advance, which ought to be the limit.

We welcome more than a thousand new readers for this our Bicentennial year. Many of these were longtime subscribers to *Mission Messenger.*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

OUR CHANGING WORLD

Subscribers of ours in Richmond, Indiana started a business 14 years ago for the purpose of providing jobs for the handicapped. Since then over 100 people have been provided full time employment with 100% success. These include deaf, blind, amputees, quadriplegic, paraplegic, post polio. They do electronic assemblies and wire harnesses. 1 wrote to these people that Ouida and I (and our partners) in our new business here in Denton (which we have not yet told you about) are inspired by their example and would like to do more of that ourselves. In our gift manufacturing business we are having the Denton State School (handicapped children) assemble some of our products for us. But we would like to do more. All of our people in business should follow the example of the Richmond Combined Enterprises, Inc. and give the handicapped a chance.

President Ford was a recent visitor to Pepperdine University. In his speech, dedicating the new field house, he saluted the Church of Christ institution as an outstanding example of those voluntarily supported institutions which have contributed so much to America's greatness and to world progress. He also said:

> Such great universities as Paris, Oxford. and Padua — dating from the Middle Ages — have a rich heritage as institutions of independent education. America proudly celebrates its 200th birthday next year. But we would have to reach back still another century to mark the founding of Harvard College in Massachusetts Bay Colony or William and Mary in Virginia or St. John's College in Maryland. Thirteen other great American universities were founded before the American Revolution. And all share in the distinguished traditions of private higher education.

The Park Row Church of Christ in Arlington, Texas recently had what might be called a Bicentennial emphasis on Sunday morning. The program was of two parts: *Our Life in Christ* and *Our Life in the Nation.* Walt Whitman's "For You O Democracy" was read and "My Country 'Tis of Thee" and "America, the Beautiful" were sung. Jim Reynolds, the minister gave a sermon on "Christian Faith and the American Revolution."

A congregation in west Texas has been having a series of group discussions, with about 13 people in each group, which is a new method of study for them. Their bulletin reflects some uneasiness with what has been going on. There is the fear that false doctrine might be injected and there is concern that the class might take over the class from the teacher. A

group leader is assigned each group to see that the correct conclusion is reached for each issue.

At least one congregation in Texas took my article on "Crumbs on the Platter" seriously enough to do something about it. They now have the "one loaf" that the scriptures speak of, one of the sisters preparing it each Sunday. It is blessed and broken, just like Jesus did, and placed on several plates for distribution. We may not have to have our own matzo factory after all!

During this Bicentennial year we will bring to your attention books and sets of books that are especially relevant to our history as well as the scriptures. High on our list is Isaac Errett's *Evenings with the Bible*, a 3-volume set that we can send you for only 12.00. Errett was the founder of the *Christian Standard* and an associate editor of Campbell's *Millennial Harbinger,* as well as a friend and fellow traveler of Campbell. Ouida and I have been reading from these volumes aloud to each other. His lessons on Joseph and Moses will thrill you. He is surely one of the clearest writers in our glorious history — and did he love the scriptures! These rather short chapters read like fireside chats, and they extend from "God the Creator" in Vol. I to "Bond of Fellowship" in Vol. 3, which is an exciting journey through the Bible. These are handsome hardback editions, but the price is in the paperback range.

Another set is the 2-volume abridged *Millennial Harbinger,* which is the best of Campbell's great journal, selected by one of his own contemporaries. These give you about 1,000 pages of his most important writings. The unabridged set is unavailable and these may not be for long. Hardback, beautifully bound. 10.95 for the set.

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

DOWN HOME *with CARL*

I am deeply grateful for the generosity shown by Leroy and Ouida in allotting me this space. I shall try to use it to benefit the Cause we love more than life itself. I regard *Mission Messenger.* which I edited, as a kind of "country and western" journal. I would not know how to be sophisticated if I wanted to be, so this column will follow my established pattern. I will use it primarily to inform you of what is happening in my life and work.

Nell and I will send a free copy of my book *The Parable of Telstar and Other Talks* to any college student in the world who writes for it. The request must include the name of the college where enrolled . . . You can secure a copy of my book *Heaven Help Us* by sending your order accompanied by a check for $2.95 to *Restoration Review.* This little volume contains my thoughts about what the Spirit can do in your life today. . . If you'd like to have free copies of my booklets on "Equipping the Saints" and "The Clergy System" write to me at the address below. There is no obligation.

March 3-5 I will be at Belmont Avenue Church of Christ, 16th and Grand A venues, Nashville, Tennessee 37212. Write to Don Finto at that address for information . . . March 17-19 will find me at Northside Church of Christ, 733 Country Club Drive, Xenia, Ohio 45385. The contact is Isaac J. Flora. . . March 24-26 I will be at New Hope Christian Church at Roanoke, Virginia 24014. Address correspondence to Russell N. Hall. The mailing address of the congregation is P.O. Box 8426.

April 9, 10 I will be speaking at the convention of Ohio Teens for Christ at Columbus, Ohio. It will be a great occasion. April 28-30 will find me at the Church of Christ, 3911 Main Street, Mineral Ridge, Ohio 44440. You may write to Charles H. Breeze, 51 Locust Street at Mineral Ridge. We hope to see you if you are in reach of any of these areas.

Have you read the Inter-Varsity publication *The Problem of Wineskins* by Howard A. Snyder? The sub-title is "Church Structure in a Technical Age." If you are caught up in defense of a traditional posture perhaps you had better not expose yourself to this keen analysis. It will get the salt out of the shaker.

A few weeks ago I read *Roots by the River,* by Marcus Miller. It deals with "the history, doctrine, and practice of the Old German Baptist Brethren in Miami County, Ohio." This was a restoration movement related to the Anabaptists, and these good people went through the same problems as did the pioneers of our own segment. They divided over many of the same things and about the same time as we did. Perhaps culture played a far greater role in our hang-ups than we are willing to admit.

Our great need is for congregations with the courage to demonstrate fearlessly the fellowship to which we are called (1 Cor. 1:9). It is not enough for a few men to talk about it, crusade for it and write about it. Just as on picture is worth a thousand words, so one congregation which openly avows it will make nothing a test of fellowship which God has not made a condition of salvation is worth a thousand articles on the theme. Fortunately we are seeing the rise of more congregations of free men and women all of the time. — *W. Carl Ketcherside, 139 Signal Hill Drive, St. Louis, Mo. 63121.*

These are the times that try men’s souls. The summer soldier and the sunshine patriot will, in this crisis, shrink from the service of his country; but he that stands it *now*, deserves the love and thanks of man and woman. Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph. - *Thomas Paine*

⁂ ⁂ ⁂

Address all mail to: 1201 Windsor Dr., Denton, TX 76201*

RESTORATION REVIEW is published monthly, except July and August, at 1201 Windsor Drive, Denton, Texas, on a second class permit.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: Individuals - $2.00 a year, or two years for $3.00; In clubs of five or more (mailed by us to separate addresses) $1.00 per name per year.